



**ADDENDUM  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL  
CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS**

---

**RFP: JXH0506**

**Addendum No: 4**

**Date of Addendum: 2/23/2015**

---

This addendum is incorporating the following change to the above-referenced RFP.

1. The Proposal Due Date and Time are hereby extended as follows:  
Proposal Due Prior to: 3:00 PM on March 13, 2015
2. All requests for explanations or clarifications must be submitted in writing to the Purchasing Office no later than February 25, 2015.
3. Responses to the vendor questions are posted below.

**Question:** In its addendum, the City makes it clear that the Proof of Concept phase will only be required by the awarded vendor. However, RFP section G (Supplemental Submittal Requirements), Item 4.1 requires that offerors submit a Proof of Concept implementation plan. Please confirm that although only the selected vendor will execute their Proof of Concept implementation plan, all offerors must submit one.

**Response:** Confirmed. The City of Austin requires a Proof of Concept implementation plan from all offerors as part of the proposal submitted. However, only the awarded vendor will move forward to the Proof of Concept phase.

**Question:** If the answer to the above question is "yes," and all offerors must submit a Proof of Concept implementation plan, it would help to know the City's expectations surrounding the Proof of Concept phase. Can the City please specify the duration of this phase?

**Response:** The Proof of Concept phase and work associated with this phase will be based upon the implementation plan provided by the respondents. In the Proof of Concept phase, the awarded vendor will be required to provide a fully testable solution (even if the installation is temporary) on a small-scale basis. This phase is to ensure that the awarded solution will work, as designed and within the requirements set forth in the RFP in the City of Austin's environment or as a hosted solution. As noted in Section 500, 3.2, the Proof of Concept will consist of temporary installation of ALPR equipment in (3) vehicles and (1) portable trailer. It will also include the hosted or backend hardware and software required to fully test the solution.

**Question:** The City's first answer in Addendum #2 directs offerors to "see Section 600, Phase 2 Evaluation factors, which provide details on the on-site demonstration" that will apply to short-listed vendors. However, "Section 600, Phase 2 Evaluation Factors" does not seem to exist (there are only Phase 1 Evaluation Factors). Can the City please provide this information in another addendum?

**Response:** The information for the onsite product demonstration is still being developed. After the proposals have been scored, the highest scoring vendors will be short-listed. The short-listed

vendors will then be contacted and receive information on the template for the product demonstration.

**Question:** Technical Requirement ID#011 reads that “the system shall provide standard data extraction Application Program Interface (API) to allow import and export of data to other systems.” Please elaborate. What other systems does the City envision exporting to or importing from, and for what general purpose? How would the City prefer that this data be extracted?

**Response:** A standard API is required for exporting data into document management systems, data warehouses and/or for storage purposes.

**Question:** Technical Requirement ID#014 reads that “the back end system shall provide the ability to exchange database information using industry accepted standard and format including XML.” Please elaborate. What database information does the City envision exchanging, and for what general purpose?

**Response:** All reads should be able to be exchanged. The general purpose of this requirement is so that the data can be stored, shared or used in conjunction with other systems already in use.

**Question:** Concerning Technical Requirement ID#019, please clarify the meaning of “integration with virtualized (VMWare) server and database infrastructures.”

**Response:** The City of Austin standard environment contains type 1 hypervisors hosting numerous guest servers and databases and is the City’s preferred architecture.

**Question:** Concerning Technical Requirement ID#076, please provide further clarification of the meaning of “single tunneling.”

**Response:** When the Vendor is connected to the City's VPN for solution support purposes, support team members will not be able to access both their local support network and the City of Austin network at the same time.

**Question:** Technical Requirement ID#055 reads that “the integrated color and infrared LPR cameras shall not emit any visible light from infrared illuminators.” A negligible amount of visible light, which is not distracting to drivers, may be present. Is this acceptable?

**Response:** Having a visible light is not acceptable. A patrol car operating in a lights out condition cannot have a visible light that provides position information. The newer IR LED’s operate in the 940 – 950nm range and do not emit a red glow.

**Question:** Regarding the City’s requirements surrounding data security, specifically Technical Requirements ID# 064, 067, and 077, please confirm that should the City select a non-hosted solution, it will be largely responsible for securing its own data when that data is at rest (as opposed to in transit). In other words, is the vendor responsible for the firewall settings, CJIS compliance, and security of data even when it is at rest in the City’s on-premise server?

**Response:** If the City selects to use a non-hosted model, the City will be responsible all local compliance and data security methods. If, as part of a non-hosted solution, secure data is transferred

outside of the City's network, the vendor will be responsible to help the City identify and secure these transfers of information.

**Question:** In the City's responses to vendors' initial questions, it states that "there are currently no specified poles for the proposed fixed mounted installation. Electrical connectivity will be the responsibility of the vendor." This response makes it impossible to submit a fixed cost for the turnkey application. Does the City want vendors to submit a cost per hour for installation? With this information and without a site visit, the vendor can only submit a fixed cost on the hardware. Furthermore, please note that the distance between the electrical source and the cameras, as it pertains to how much conduit will be needed to connect these systems, may vary by location and therefore may vary the costs. That said,

**Response:** A cost per hour is acceptable for installation. A cost per foot of conduit is acceptable for the installation, as the distances are unknown. The hourly rate will be evaluated with the total cost proposal.

**Question:** Is the City considering one camera per lane for optimum reads?

**Response:** The City of Austin will defer to the vendor on recommending the solution that would provide optimum reads.

**Question:** Will these cameras be located over the lanes, or on an angle?

**Response:** The City of Austin will defer to the vendor on recommending the placement of the cameras that would provide optimum reads.

**Question:** Do we need to factor in installing new poles or extensions to improve optimum reads? Having more than one camera on the same pole cuts down the price because we can connect up to four cameras to one router for cellular connection.

**Response:** Due to the fact that there are currently no specified poles for the proposed fixed mount installation, please price out installation of new poles. The City of Austin will defer to the vendor on recommending number of cameras per router.

**Question:** In the City's responses to vendors' initial questions, it states that "the only preference the City has [regarding fixed ALPR cameras] is no recurring costs." If we use a router for network connectivity and an air card, we can factor the first year into the pricing. Additional years on the contract would incur these same costs for these air cards. Is this acceptable? Alternatively, would the City prefer vendors to factor in four years of air card usage to cover the full possible length of the contract so that the City does not have a recurring cost?

**Response:** Please provide the air card usage cost per year.

**Question:** Given the complexity of the RFP and addenda, along with the challenges of providing thorough responses to the RFP's many legal and technical requirements, would the City grant another two-week extension? This would result in a due date of March 5.

**Response:** Yes, the new proposal due date is extended to March 5, 2015.

**Question:** Will the City accept/consider a formal response from a respondent for the fixed and trailer mounted LPR portion of the RFP "only?"

**Response:** The City of Austin is looking for a turn-key solution to the RFP. Responding vendors must meet all the requirements in the proposal to be considered for award. A successful ALPR system will meet all of the requirements in the proposal, be scalable for future expansion and integrate seamlessly with hosted data sources and the city of Austin's existing state, national and local databases of stolen vehicles of interest data.

4. ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.

BY THE SIGNATURES affixed below, this Addendum is hereby incorporated into and made a part of the above-referenced Request for Proposal.

APPROVED BY:



Jonathan Harris, Sr. Buyer Specialist  
Purchasing Office

Feb. 23, 2015  
Date

ACKNOWLEDGED BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vendor Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**RETURN ONE COPY OF THIS ADDENDUM TO THE PURCHASING OFFICE, CITY OF AUSTIN WITH YOUR RESPONSE OR PRIOR TO THE SOLICITATION CLOSING DATE. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY CONSTITUTE GROUNDS FOR REJECTION.**